

Appendix B

State and National Programs Participating in the Study of Service in AmeriCorps

National Direct or State Commission Sponsor	Program
Alabama Commission on National and Community Service	Birmingham Public Schools
Alaska State Community Service Commission	Child Development Americorps
Alaska State Community Service Commission	Rural CAP Alaska EPA AmeriCorps Program-RAVEN
Alaska State Community Service Commission	Nine Star Enterprises, Inc.
Allegheny County Health Department	Allegheny County Health Department
Allegheny County Health Department	Chicago Health Consortium
American National Red Cross	American National Red Cross - Seattle
American National Red Cross	American National Red Cross - Atlanta
American National Red Cross	American National Red Cross - Philadelphia
American National Red Cross	American National Red Cross - Dallas
Arkansas Commission on National and Community Service	Blytheville Truancy & Dropout Prevention Program
California Commission on Improving Life Through Service	Imperial County Office of Education
California Commission on Improving Life Through Service	Bay Area Youth Agency Consortium
California Commission on Improving Life Through Service	California Conservation Corps Watershed Stewards
California Commission on Improving Life Through Service	Child Abuse Prevention Council of Sacramento, Inc.
California Commission on Improving Life Through Service	East San Gabriel Valley Partnership AmeriCorps Project
California Commission on Improving Life Through Service	Los Angeles Unified School District
California Commission on Improving Life Through Service	California HIPPY Corps Reads
Colorado Governor's Commission on Nat'l & Community Service	Community College of Denver
Colorado Governor's Commission on Nat'l & Community Service	Mesa State College AmeriCorps Project
Connecticut Commission on National and Community Service	City of Meriden, Connecticut - CITYSERVE/AmeriCorps
Delaware Community Service Commission	Delaware Center for Educational Technology
Earth Conservation Corps	Salmon Corps - Nez Perce
Enterprise Foundation, Inc.	The Enterprise - Santa Fe

National Direct or State Commission Sponsor	Program
Enterprise Foundation, Inc.	The Enterprise - Dallas
Enterprise Foundation, Inc.	The Enterprise - Cleveland
Florida Commission on Community Service	The School Board of Gadsen County
Florida Commission on Community Service	St. Petersburg Junior College
Governor of Guam / Governor's Community Outreach - Federal Programs	Office of the Governor, Guam
Illinois Commission on Community Service	Aunt Marthas Youth Service Center, Inc.
Illinois Commission on Community Service	Public Allies- Chicago
Illinois Commission on Community Service	Illinois Department of Children and Family Services
Indiana Gov's Commission on Community Service & Volunteerism	Life Treatment Centers, Inc.
Indiana Gov's Commission on Community Service & Volunteerism	Indiana Dept. of Environmental Management
Iowa Commission on Community Service	Trees Forever - Deepening Roots
Iowa Commission on Community Service	Great River AmeriCorps
Kentucky Commission on Community Volunteerism and Service	Homeless and Housing Coalition
Kentucky Commission on Community Volunteerism and Service	Community Action of Southern Kentucky, Inc.
Local Initiatives Support Corporation	Boston LISC
Local Initiatives Support Corporation	Multi-City Michigan LISC
Local Initiatives Support Corporation	New York LISC
Local Initiatives Support Corporation	Puget Sound LISC
Louisiana Serve Commission	Les Reflections du Bayou
Lower Mississippi Delta Service Corps	Louisiana Delta Service Corps Inc
Maine Commission on National and Community Service	Maine Conservation Corps
Maryland Governor's Office on Service & Volunteerism	Community Assisting Police
Maryland Governor's Office on Service & Volunteerism	Dept. of Natural Resources - Maryland Conservation Corps
Maryland Governor's Office on Service & Volunteerism	Homecorps Americorps
Massachusetts Service Alliance	Generations, Inc (Magic Me/Boston, Inc.)
Massachusetts Service Alliance	Greater Holyoke Foundation, Inc.
Michigan Community Service Commission	Creston Neighborhood Association
Michigan Community Service Commission	Michigan Family Independence Agency
Michigan Community Service Commission	City Year Detroit
Minnesota Commission on National and Community Service	City of St. Paul - Future Force
Minnesota Commission on National and Community Service	Pillsbury Neighborhood Services

National Direct or State Commission Sponsor	Program
Mississippi Commission for Volunteer Service	Center for Community Development, Delta State University
Missouri Community Service Commission	American Youth Foundation (Safety Corps)
Montana Community Services Advisory Council	The University of Montana - Reads
National AIDS Fund, Inc.	National AIDS Fund AmeriCorps Program
National AIDS Fund, Inc.	The Regional HIV/AIDS Consortium (NC)
National Association of Community Health Centers, Inc.	Colorado/Metro Denver
National Association of Community Health Centers, Inc.	Sea Mar Comm. Health Center
Nebraska Volunteer Service Commission	Community Action of Nebraska, Inc.
New Hampshire Job Training Council	North Country Americorps
New Jersey Commission on National and Community Service	Urban League of Hudson County
New Jersey Commission on National and Community Service	St. Paul's Community Development corp.
New York Office of National and Community Service	Monroe Community College
New York Office of National and Community Service	Oswego City - County Youth Bureau
New York Office of National and Community Service	Phoenix House Foundation, Inc.
New York Office of National and Community Service	Rheedlen Centers for Children and Families
New York Office of National and Community Service	Public Space for Public Life - The Parks Council/The National and Social Initiative
New York Office of National and Community Service	Church Avenue Merchants Association, Inc. (CAMBA)
North Carolina Commission on National & Community Service	Children First of Buncombe County
Northeastern University	Athletes in Service
Ohio Governor's Community Service Council	Youth & Communities in Partnership
Ohio Governor's Community Service Council	Greater Cleveland Habitat for Humanity
Ohio Governor's Community Service Council	Mercy Health Partners
Oregon Community Service Commission	Portland Community Building
PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of Citizen Service	Family Service Corps
PennSERVE: The Governor's Office of Citizen Service	City Year, Philadelphia
Phoenix House Foundation, Inc.	Phoenix House of Texas
Phoenix House Foundation, Inc.	Phoenix House of California
Public Allies, Inc.	Public Allies South Bay/Silicon Valley
Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes

National Direct or State Commission Sponsor	Program
Tennessee State Commission on National and Community Service	NashvilleREAD, Inc. (Competitive)
Tennessee State Commission on National and Community Service	NashvilleREAD, Inc. (Formula)
Tennessee State Commission on National and Community Service	United Neighborhood Health Services, Inc.
Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service	Central Texas Armed Services YMCA
Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service	Youth and Family Alliance (Formerly Youth Options, Inc./Middle Earth)
Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service	Mental Health Association in Texas
Texas Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service	United Way of San Antonio and Bexar County
The Arc of The United States	Arc of Montgomery County
The ASPIRA Association Inc.	ASPIRA Corps- PA
The Houston READ Commission	Houston Read Commission - Literacy AmeriCorps
The Houston READ Commission	Palm Beach County Literacy Coalition
United States Veterans Initiative, Inc.	United States Veterans Initiative, Inc. - DC
United States Veterans Initiative, Inc.	United States Veterans Initiative, Inc. - LA
University of Maryland Baltimore County	Milwaukee Community Service Corps
University of Maryland Baltimore County	Clear Corps
University of Maryland Baltimore County	PBX, Inc.
University of Maryland Baltimore County	SS/UMBC Coalition to End Childhood Lead Poisoning
Utah Commission on Volunteers	Association for Utah Community Health
Utah Commission on Volunteers	Salt Lake County Reads and Promotes Service
Virginia Commission on National & Community Service	Hampton Redevelopment and Housing - 2
Virginia Commission on National & Community Service	City of Richmond - Human Services Commission
Washington Commission on National and Community Service	Washington State Employment Security Department
Wisconsin National & Community Service Board	America Reads / Wisconsin Reads
Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Fnd.	Notre Dame Americorps
YouthBuild USA, Inc.	Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee

Appendix C

Issues Related to Quasi-Experimental Design

“Serving Country and Community: A Study of Service in AmeriCorps” will attempt to attribute changes in AmeriCorps members to participation. An impact study is generally so defined because it attempts to identify program effects that *cause* the change in outcomes.

In order to assess the effects of participation in AmeriCorps on members, it is necessary to understand what would have happened to them if they had not enrolled in the program. From an evaluation perspective, the most accurate way of assessing impact is to use an experimental research design to randomly assign individuals into treatment and control groups. However, it was determined that random assignment would not be feasible for the purposes of this study. “Serving Country and Community: A Study of Service in AmeriCorps” is instead based on a quasi-experimental design. Quasi-experimental research designs rely upon non-randomly formed comparison groups. While it is possible to calculate an estimate of program impact based on comparisons of non-randomly assigned groups, the non-comparability of the groups does not yield unbiased estimates. With non-randomly formed groups, the possibility always exists that some initial difference between individuals in the two groups may be responsible for any impact found. Hence, we are not able to attribute impacts to the intervention as confidently as we would under a pure random experimental design.

Although random assignment is universally accepted as the gold standard of research designs for drawing causal inferences, it is often difficult, and sometimes infeasible, to implement in field settings. Given the impracticality of carrying it out nationwide with the AmeriCorps population, our recommended strategy for designing a study of AmeriCorps impacts was based on using quasi-experimental comparison groups. Because no single comparison group is optimal, we recommended that a combination of groups formed at both the national and local level be used to estimate impacts on members. Due to cost constraints, however, the Corporation was able to support only a national comparison group for this study.

A national comparison group, thus, was constructed for both the AmeriCorps*State and National and AmeriCorps*NCCC samples from a pool of eligible individuals who, for one reason or another, did not enter the program. These were people who either made inquiries to the AmeriCorps program but did not apply or who applied to but did not enter the program. Although this should not be viewed as an adequate substitute for random assignment, the attractiveness of this approach lies in the increased ability to match the two groups better in terms of motivation or interest in the program. Comparison group members, for example, could have decided to enter another form of national service or opted not to enter the program because of a mismatch between individual interests and program needs.

Methodologically, the eligible applicant option provides the strongest test of the causal hypothesis that it is the service experience that is leading to the change in outcome. It was a viable option for the entire AmeriCorps*NCCC program because there is a national waiting list of eligible individuals interested in entering the program. Applicants are ranked by AmeriCorps*NCCC program staff on a set of qualifying characteristics (e.g., suitability) for entry into AmeriCorps. This yields more information on the process of selection into the program in terms of explaining, for example, which non-participants were screened out vs. those who dropped out voluntarily.

Our final approach for designing a study of impacts on AmeriCorps members was based on two strategies. For the State and National programs, a national comparison group has been constructed by drawing a sample of 1,529 individuals who made inquiries to the Corporation for National Service about enrolling in national service, but who did not enroll.

For the AmeriCorps*NCCC program, a national comparison group ($n=411$) has been constructed from a national waiting list of eligible individuals interested in entering the program who were determined eligible, but who declined to enter or who were not accepted into the program due to the limited number of slots. Applicants were ranked by AmeriCorps*NCCC program staff on a set of qualifying characteristics for entry into AmeriCorps. This additional data will yield useful information on the process of selection into the program for our analysis and offers the opportunity to explore ways of creating better-matched comparison groups.

To sum up, this study uses the experiences of a comparison group of similar individuals who did not join AmeriCorps as a proxy for what would have happened to AmeriCorps members in the absence of the program. Moreover, as a way to control for differences in the two groups at baseline, the study compares *changes* in outcomes for AmeriCorps members with *changes* in outcomes over the same time period for comparison group members

Appendix D

Sampling and Weighting Procedures

Sampling Frame

The target population for “Serving Country and Community: A Study of Service in AmeriCorps” is all incoming members of the AmeriCorps*State and National and AmeriCorps*NCCC programs in the 1999-2000 program year. The study of outcomes is based on a probability sample of full-time members who were in their initial year of AmeriCorps service.

AmeriCorps*State and National and AmeriCorps*NCCC programs were treated as two separate strata for sample selection. A sample of members was selected from each group. The sampling frame for each stratum was constructed in two stages. At the first stage, a list of programs or locations in each stream with the number of members in each program, was constructed and used to select a sample of program sites. Because there are only five regions or locations for the AmeriCorps*NCCC program, three regions were included in the sample to ensure representativeness.²³ For the second-stage selection, a sampling frame was constructed for each selected program using the projected number of full-time first-year members from the selected programs. The following table shows the number of programs, expected number of members, and the sample size in each program.

Exhibit 3		
Population and Sample Sizes by Program Stream		
	Universe	Sample
Programs		
State and National	650	109 ^a
NCCC	5	3
Total	655	112
Members		
State and National	17,233	1,762
NCCC	804	477
Total	18,037	2,239

^a The State and National sample included two Tribal Programs.

²³ AmeriCorps*NCCC members are randomly assigned to the five regional campuses.

A sample of 109 programs was selected from the population of State and National programs (n=650). All first-year, full-time members were selected from each selected program, yielding a total sample of 1,762 members at baseline. All first-year members in the three selected AmeriCorps*NCCC regions also were included in the sample, in view of the small number of regions from which the sample would be drawn, and the need to provide accurate estimates of member characteristics.

Sample Selection

A sample of programs was selected using a stratified sampling design. The State and National program sample was stratified by program type, Census region, and size group where size was equal to the number of full-time members in a program. There were four types of programs: State-Formula, State-Competitive, National and National/State. Within each program type, a total of eight strata were created by taking the cross-classification of four Census regions and two size groups. A systematic sample of programs was selected from each stratum, after sorting the list by urbanicity (urban, rural or other), focus of the program, and the number of full-time and part-time members, to ensure representativeness for these variables.²⁴

Weighting and Estimation

For producing population-based estimates, each program in the sample as well as each member in that program received a sampling weight. The final sampling weight combined the base sampling weight, which reflects the probability of selection, and an adjustment for nonresponding members.

The base sampling weight for a program selected in the sample reflects the probability of selection of a program in the stratum. In this case, it is simply the ratio of the number of programs in the population divided by the number selected in the sample.

Let N_h denote the number of programs in the population in the h^{th} stratum. Let n_h denote the number of programs selected in the sample. The base program sampling weight is expressed as:

$$W_{ih} = \frac{N_h}{n_h}$$

²⁴ Originally a total of 111 State and National programs were selected. Two programs were dropped from the sample because they did not receive funding for the 1999-2000 program year. In addition, a total of 84 programs were replaced in the sample by randomly selected replicates because their intake dates occurred prior to the beginning of data collection or they were expecting to enroll fewer than five full-time members.

Since all eligible members in a selected program are included in the sample, the conditional base sampling weight for members in the sample is one. Let the number of members selected in the sample from the i^{th} program in the h^{th} stratum be M_{ih} . If data are available only for M_{ih}^* members, then the nonresponse adjustment to a weight of one is equal to:

$$\frac{M_{ih}}{M_{ih}^*}$$

The overall member weight is thus equal to:

$$w_{ih} \frac{M_{ih}}{M_{ih}^*}$$

These weights are used to compute the estimates of population parameters relating to member characteristics described in this report.

Standard Errors of the Estimates

Estimates based on a sample will differ from the values obtained from a complete census of the programs and members. This difference arising from the use of a sample is called sampling error. The standard error is a measure of the sampling error of an estimate. SUDAAN software was used to compute standard errors of the various estimates described in the main body of the report. SUDAAN takes into account the sample design used to draw a sample of programs and members while computing standard errors. In addition to standard errors, SUDAAN also calculates the design effects of the estimates. The design effect for an estimate relating to programs is the square of the ratio of the standard error of the estimate under the design used to select programs to the standard error that we would have estimated if we had taken a simple random sample of programs.

The estimates and the standard errors can be used to construct confidence intervals. For example, if the estimated percentage of programs having a certain characteristic is 50 percent and its standard error is 2 percent, then a 95 percent confidence interval for the unknown population percentage is 46 to 54. That is, we have 95 percent confidence that the unknown population percentage is contained in the interval 46 to 54.

Appendix E

Participation of AmeriCorps Members and National Population in Service During Prior 12 Months

	Average Hours per Month, Total Sample	Percent Serving during Prior 12 Months	Average Hours per Month for Those Who Served in Past 12 Months
National Population ^a	8.8	48.8	18.2
AmeriCorps			
Overall	17.2	58.4%	29.5
State and National	17.6	57.6%	30.5
AmeriCorps*NCCC	12.1	69.7%	17.4
Gender			
Women	15.1	59.4%	25.4
Men	22.4	55.9%	40.1
Age			
< 25	15.4	56.8%	27.2
≥ 25	20.1	61.2%	32.9
Race			
White	13.7	61.0%	22.5
Black or African American	22.9	54.9	41.8
Hispanic or Latino	18.3	55.7	32.8
Multiracial	16.0	65.1	24.6
Asian	14.6	56.4	25.8
American Indian/Alaskan Native	14.4	48.5	29.7
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	26.0	64.2	40.5
Education			
< Bachelor's degree	18.4	55.4%	33.3
≥ Bachelor's degree	14.8	65.4%	22.6
Marital status			
Single, never married	16.5	57.1%	28.9
Married	16.6	63.8%	26.0
Widowed, divorced, separated	22.1	59.7%	37.0
<p>a 1995 national figures as reported by <i>Giving and Volunteering in the U.S., 1996</i>. Independent Sector, Washington, D.C., 1996. Hours were reported on a weekly basis. We multiply them by 4.33 here to obtain monthly figures.</p>			

Appendix F

Constructs Used in Baseline Comparability Analysis

F.1 List of Composite Measures

I. Civic Engagement:

A. Identification I (*Range: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree*):

- 1) I have a strong attachment to my community.
- 2) I often discuss and think about how larger political and social issues affect my community.
- 3) I am aware of what can be done to meet the important needs in my community.
- 4) I feel I have the ability to make a difference in my community.
- 5) I try to find the time or a way to make a positive difference in my community.

B. Identification II (*Range: 1 = Know nothing to 5 = Know a great deal*)

How much do you feel you know about problems facing the community such as:

- 1) The environment?
- 2) Public health issues?
- 3) Literacy?
- 4) Crime?

C. Responsibility (*Range: 1 = Not an important obligation to 3 = Very important obligation*)

- 1) Serving on a jury if called.
- 2) Reporting a crime that you may have witnessed.
- 3) Participating in neighborhood organizations.
- 4) Voting in elections.
- 5) Keeping informed about news and public issues.
- 6) Helping to keep the neighborhood safe.
- 7) Helping to keep the neighborhood clean and beautiful.
- 8) Helping those who are less fortunate.
- 9) Working to correct social and economic inequalities.
- 10) Having a job that involves working with other people.
- 11) Working in a job where I am of direct service to people.

Range = Yes/No

- 1) Did you vote in the 1998 national election?
- 2) Were you registered to vote in the 1998 election?

D. Service Perception (*Range: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree*)

- 1) I felt I made a contribution to the community.
- 2) I re-examined my beliefs and attitudes about myself.
- 3) I was exposed to new ideas and ways of seeing the world.
- 4) I felt like part of a community.
- 5) I learned about the "real" world.
- 6) I felt I could make a difference in the life of at least one person.
- 7) I did things I never thought I could do.
- 8) I changed some of my beliefs and attitudes.

E. Involvement–Participation (*Range: 1 = Never to 5 = Always*)

- 1) Participate in events such as community meetings.
- 2) Join organizations that support issues that are important to me.
- 3) Write or e-mail newspapers or organizations to voice my views.
- 4) Vote in local elections.
- 5) Try to learn as much as I can about candidates or ballot questions.
- 6) Keep informed about local or national news

F. Involvement–Attitudes (*Yes/No*)

- 1) Help to take care of sick, elderly, or homeless people.
- 2) Tutor, mentor, or take care of children, teenagers, or adults.
- 3) Help renovate, construct or clean offices or buildings for needy people.
- 4) Organize or do administrative work for programs for helping needy individuals.
- 5) Clean trails or do other environment work.

G. Involvement–Prior Participation (*Yes/No*)

- 1) Saw someone in family help others.
- 2) Personally saw someone you admire helping others.
- 3) Were active in student government.
- 4) Were active in a church group, religious organization, or community group.
- 5) Ever participated in voluntary community service
- 6) Participated in voluntary community service in past 5 years
- 7) Participated in voluntary community service in past 12 months

Number of hours

- 8) Mean hours of participation in voluntary community service in past 12 months

II. Employment

A. Basic Work Skills (*Range: Amount of experience: 1 = Little or none to 3 = A lot; Importance to you: 1 = Not important to 3 = Very important*)

- 1) Solving unexpected problems or finding new and better ways to do things.
- 2) Knowing how to gather and analyze information from different sources such as people/organizations.
- 3) Listening and responding to other people's suggestions or concerns.
- 4) Stopping or decreasing conflicts between people.
- 5) Leading a team by taking charge, explaining and motivating co-workers.
- 6) Negotiating, compromising, and getting along with co-workers, supervisors.
- 7) Learning new ways of thinking or acting from other people.
- 8) Adapting your plans or ways of doing things in response to changing circumstances.
- 9) Managing your time when you're under pressure.
- 10) Dealing with uncomfortable or difficult working conditions.

III. Life Skills

A. Diversity–Attitudes (*Range: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree*)

- 1) If people from different backgrounds took the time to understand each other, there wouldn't be so many social problems.
- 2) If I lead the way, my friends will get involved in fighting prejudice.
- 3) Some of my friends are of different backgrounds from me: racial, cultural, ethnic or language.
- 4) Racism affects everyone.
- 5) I feel comfortable belonging to groups where people are different from me.

B. Diversity–Attitudes

(*Range: 1 = Not very interested to 5 = Very interested*)

- 1) Interest in forming friendships with people who come from different race or ethnicity from you.
- 2) Interest in looking for opportunities to work with people from different backgrounds.

(*Range: 1 = Very uncomfortable to 5 = Very comfortable*)

- 3) Comfort level in talking about social barriers, race and/or diversity with others from different backgrounds than you?

C. Diversity–Knowledge (*Range: 1 = Know nothing to 5 = Know a great deal*)

How much you feel you know about concerns/issues facing :

- 1) African Americans
- 2) Asian Americans

- 3) Hispanics/Spanish/Latinos
- 4) Whites, non-Latinos
- 5) People with low incomes
- 6) Rural young people
- 7) Urban young people
- 8) Older/elder people
- 9) The disabled

D. Teamwork (*Range: 1 = Never to 5 = Always*)

- 1) I try to understand other team members' ideas and opinions before arguing or stating my own.
- 2) I try to present my ideas without criticizing the ideas of others.
- 3) I encourage different points of view without worrying about agreement.
- 4) I try to consider all points of view or possible options before forming an opinion or making a decision.
- 5) I encourage the participation of other team members and support their right to be heard.
- 6) I help find solutions when unexpected problems arise.
- 7) We discuss issues and problems and share ideas.
- 8) We involve everyone and avoid favoritism.
- 9) We can disagree and be different from one another without fear.
- 10) We take time to work out any conflicts.

E. Efficacy–Civic (*Range: 1 = Would not be able to get this done to 3 = Would be able to get this done.*)

- 1) Getting the local government to fix a pothole in my street.
- 2) Getting the local government to build an addition to the community center.
- 3) Organizing an event to benefit a charity or religious organization.
- 4) Getting an issue on the ballot for a state-wide election.
- 5) Starting an after-school program for children whose parents work.
- 6) Organizing an annual cleanup program for the local park.

F. Efficacy–Education (*Range: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree*)

- 1) I have mostly bad luck when it comes to education.
- 2) I can work really hard when it comes to getting the education I need.
- 3) I have the intelligence I need to finish my education.
- 4) If I don't finish my education, it is because I didn't have the chance.
- 5) To get the education I need, I have to be lucky.
- 6) When I have trouble with schoolwork, it's because the teachers don't like me.
- 7) I can't figure out what it takes to finish my education.

G. Efficacy–Employment (*Range: 1 = Not at all true for me to 5 = Very true for me*)

- 1) There aren't enough jobs for me to get the kind of job I want.
- 2) I can't get people to treat me fairly when I apply for the kind of job I want.
- 3) I can't seem to try very hard to get a good job.
- 4) I don't know what it takes to get the kind of job I want.
- 5) If I can't get a good job, it's because people aren't fair to people like me.
- 6) To get a good job I just have to try hard enough.

F.2 Results of Reliability Analyses of the Composite Measures

In these analyses, for each of the constructed scales, a statistic called a Cronbach alpha coefficient was computed. These coefficients indicate how consistently the respondents performed across items within a common scale. Coefficient alpha coefficients can range from 0 to 1, where a score of 1 indicates a perfectly consistent scale. In social science research, Cronbach alphas ranging from .7 and above are considered to be indicators of an adequate level of internal consistency. As can be seen from the accompanying exhibit, the overwhelming majority of the scales in the field testing demonstrated adequate levels of item internal consistency. As a result, we have increased our confidence in reporting on these items as a group.

	Number of Items	Cronbach Coefficient Alpha	Number of Respondents
Civic Engagement			
Civic Attitudes-Identification	5	0.74	4139
Civic Attitudes-Knowledge	5	0.78	4151
Civic Attitude-Responsibility	11	0.67	4096
Prior Service Perception	8	0.82	2492
Prior Service Participation	6	0.73	4112
Employment			
Basic Work Skills-Amount of Experience	10	0.76	4056
Basic Work Skills-Importance to You	10	0.69	3523
Life Skills			
Diversity-Attitudes (1)	15	0.77	3884
Diversity-Attitudes (2)	3	0.73	4140
Diversity-Knowledge	9	0.79	4089
Teamwork	10	0.84	4132
Efficacy – Civic	6	0.72	4118
Efficacy – Education	7	0.75	4105
Efficacy – Employment	5	0.76	4131

Appendix G

Statistical and Practical Significance

In order to assess the baseline comparability between the AmeriCorps and comparison groups within both AmeriCorps*State and National and AmeriCorps*NCCC, we conducted a series of statistical inferential tests. Differences are only reported here for values of $p < .002$.²⁵

In interpreting these results, a word of caution is in order. In designing this study, a large enough sample was created to enhance statistical power, and thus enable the detection of very small statistically significant effects. Statistical significance, however, is merely an indication of the likelihood of the observed result. It does not necessarily say that something important or meaningful has been observed. Substantive or practical significance is primarily based on a judgment relevant to policy considerations. The determination of practical significance can be derived from examination of how mean differences translate into the magnitude of actual differences on the individual items underlying the constructs being measured.

For example, we report further that the State and National treatment group scored statistically significantly lower on several scales measuring civic engagement or life skills, with differences of as little as .08 on a five-point scale. In practical terms, this could mean very little actual difference in terms of the differences of the percentages of respondents agreeing or disagreeing with a particular item. In addition, differences between groups can be expressed in terms of standardized effect sizes, which provide a useful metric of the strength or magnitude of an otherwise uninterpretable difference. In our future analyses we will provide these more detailed breakdowns, which will illuminate the results beyond the mere reporting of statistically significant results.

²⁵ For each individual statistical test conducted (two-tailed), the level of statistical significance was set at $p = .05$. Conducting a series of statistical tests on the same set of data runs the risk of finding significant differences between groups by chance alone. Within the context of conducting multiple statistical tests simultaneously, we thus conservatively reset p at $.05/K$ to control the overall error rate for each set of comparisons within State and National and AmeriCorps*NCCC (where K = number of comparisons between the two groups). In the State and National analyses, 26 comparisons were conducted vs. a total of 27 for the NCCC, thus rendering the effective significance level at $.05/26$ or $.05/27 = .002$. To protect ourselves from reporting findings based on chance, we only signal significant findings at the more stringent level of .002 for the purposes of this report.

Appendix H

Comparison of Treatment and Comparison Groups

H.1: AmeriCorps*State and National

H.2: Americorps*NCCC

Exhibit H.1
Baseline Comparison (State and National)

Characteristic	Treatment Group			Comparison Group			Mean Difference
	N	Mean	Std. Error	N	Mean	Std. Error	
Demographics							
Gender(% male)	1746	29.0	1.26	1528	21.7	.92	**
Race (% white)	1729	46.2	1.48	1484	55.2	1.09	**
Age (years)	1723	27.9	.29	1516	27.7	.21	
Education (% bachelor's degree)	1741	29.8	1.41	1528	36.8	1.03	**
I. Civic Engagement							
IA. Civic Attitudes–Identification ^a	1732	3.91	.02	1523	3.95	.01	
IB. Civic Attitudes–Knowledge ^b	1743	3.56	.02	1527	3.57	.02	
IC. Civic Attitudes–Responsibilities ^c	1698	2.69	.01	1519	2.75	.01	**
Voting in the 1998 national election (%)	1527	54.7	1.61	1395	66.1	1.07	**
Registered to vote in the 1998 national election (%)	1523	73.2	1.38	1395	80.0	.92	**
ID. Prior Service–Perception ^a	989	4.09	.03	885	4.12	.01	
IE. Prior Service–Participation ^d	1723	3.11	.02	1517	3.32	.02	**
IF. Involvement–Attitudes: Number of Activities ⁱ	1567	1.76	.04	1519	1.71	.03	
IG. Involvement–Prior Participation ^j	1631	2.61	.03	1515	2.89	.02	**
Prior participation in voluntary community service							
Ever (%)	1749	81.4	1.01	1529	89.1	.74	**
Past 5 years (%)	1740	77.1	1.18	1527	81.9	.86	*
Past 12 months (%)	1740	57.6	1.46	1526	58.4	1.07	
Mean hours of participation (past 12 months)	1740	17.6	.85	1496	11.3	.62	**
II. Employment							
IIA. Basic Work Skills–Amount of Experience ^g	1648	2.47	.01	1527	2.47	.01	
IIB. Basic Work Skills–Importance to You ^c	1684	2.59	.01	1528	2.60	.01	
III. Life Skills							
IIIA. Diversity–Attitudes ^a (1)	1675	4.17	.01	1521	4.28	.01	**
IIIB. Diversity–Attitudes ^h (2)	1738	4.34	.02	1521	4.42	.01	**
IIIC. Diversity–Knowledge ^b	1683	3.45	.02	1527	3.55	.01	**
IIID. Teamwork	1726	4.05	.02	1526	4.08	.01	*
IIIE. Efficacy – Civic ^e	1726	2.32	.01	1514	2.44	.01	**
IIIF. Efficacy – Educational ^a	1711	4.32	.02	1514	4.34	.01	
IIIG. Efficacy – Employment ^f	1731	4.23	.02	1520	4.31	.02	*

a Possible range: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree

b Possible range: 1 = Know nothing to 5 = Know a great deal

c Possible range: 1 = Not important to 3 = Very important

d Possible range: 1 = Never to 5 = Always

e Possible range: 1 = I would not be able to get this done to 3 = I would be able to get this done

f Possible range: 1 = Not true at all to 5 = Very true

g Possible range: 1 = Little or none to 3 = A lot

h Possible range: 1 = Not very interested to 5 = Very interested

i Possible range: 0 to 5

j Possible range: 0 to 4

*Significant at = .05

**Significant at = .002

Exhibit H.2
Baseline Comparison (AmeriCorps*NCCC)

Characteristic	Treatment Group			Comparison Group			Mean Difference
	N	Mean	Std. Error	N	Mean	Std. Error	
Demographics							
Gender(% male)	476	32.3	1.83	410	26.1	2.91	*
Race (% white)	465	85.6	1.47	403	80.4	2.31	*
Age (years)	472	21.5	.08	410	21.3	.12	
Education (% bachelor's degree)	476	50.2	1.97	410	39.3	3.14	**
Application Score	436	86.6	.34	410	81.5	.50	**
I. Civic Engagement							
IA. Civic Attitudes–Identification ^a	474	3.75	.02	410	3.87	.04	*
IB. Civic Attitudes–Knowledge ^b	471	3.37	.03	410	3.44	.04	
IC. Civic Attitudes–Responsibilities ^c	471	2.67	.01	408	2.74	.01	**
Voting in the 1998 national election (%)	373	48.8	2.32	328	54.0	3.24	
Registered to vote in the 1998 national election (%)	368	74.2	2.08	326	70.8	2.87	
ID. Prior Service–Perception ^a	329	3.97	.03	289	4.06	.04	
IE. Prior Service–Participation ^d	465	3.07	.03	407	3.27	.04	**
IF. Involvement–Attitudes: Number of Activities ⁱ	445	1.77	.05	404	1.92	.07	
IG. Involvement–Prior Participation ^j	462	2.56	.04	405	2.86	.07	**
Prior participation in voluntary community service							
Ever (%)	478	93.5	.96	410	94.1	1.54	
Past 5 years (%)	478	90.2	1.15	410	92.2	1.84	
Past 12 months (%)	478	69.7	1.82	408	70.8	2.91	
Mean hours of participation (past 12 months)	478	12.1	.95	395	12.5	1.55	
I. Employment							
IIA. Basic Work Skills–Amount of Experiences ^g	471	2.46	.01	410	2.46	.02	
IIB. Basic Work Skills–Importance to You ^c	468	2.63	.01	410	2.59	.01	*
III. Life Skills							
IIIA. Diversity–Attitudes ^a (1)	465	4.23	.02	410	4.28	.03	*
IIIB. Diversity–Attitudes ^b (2)	472	4.42	.02	409	4.39	.04	
IIIC. Diversity–Knowledge ^b	470	3.31	.02	409	3.49	.04	**
IIID. Teamwork ^d	471	4.01	.02	409	4.10	.03	*
IIIE. Efficacy – Civic ^e	474	2.38	.01	404	2.51	.02	**
IIIF. Efficacy – Educational ^a	470	4.41	.02	410	4.33	.03	*
IIIG. Efficacy – Employment ^f	472	4.28	.03	408	4.32	.04	

a Possible range: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree

b Possible range: 1 = Know nothing to 5 = Know a great deal

c Possible range: 1 = Not important to 3 = Very important

d Possible range: 1 = Never to 5 = Always

e Possible range: 1 = I would not be able to get this done to 3 = I would be able to get this done

f Possible range: 1 = Not true at all to 5 = Very true

g Possible range: 1 = Little or none to 3 = A lot

h Possible range: 1 = Not very interested to 5 = Very interested

i Possible range: 0 to 5

j Possible range: 0 to 4

*Significant at = .05

**Significant at = .002

Appendix I

Instruments with Items Included in the Final Version of the Survey

Aguirre International. *AmeriCorps Members Life Skills Inventory*, June 1999, CA.

Center for Community Service at John Carroll University. *Undergraduate College Students' Experiences in Community Service and Volunteering*.

Census 2000. Bureau of the Census. United States Department of Commerce.

City Year. *City Year 1998: Alumni Longitudinal Survey*.

Conell, James, Jean Baldwin Grossman, and Nancy Resch. *The Urban Corps Assessment Package (URCAP) Manual*. Public/Private Ventures (PPV). September 1995.

Furco, Andrew, Parisa Muller, & Mary Sue Ammon. "Civic Responsibility Survey." Service-Learning Research & Development Center. Graduate School of Education. University of California at Berkeley. 1998.

Gardenswartz, Lee and Anita Rowe. *The Managing Diversity Survival Guide*. Irwin Professional Publisher. 1994.

***High School & Beyond: 1980-86 Seniors.* National Education Longitudinal Studies of the National Center for Education Statistics.**

Higher Education Research Institute. Graduate School of Education at the University of California – Los Angeles. *Cooperative Institutional Research Program Freshman Survey*.

Independent Sector. *Volunteering and Giving Among Teenagers 12 to 17 years of Age*. 1996.

Macro International. *Study of Race, Class, and Ethnicity in AmeriCorps Programs*. November 1997.

Montebello, Anthony R. *Work Teams that Work*. Best Sellers Publishing, Minneapolis, 1994.

***National Educational Longitudinal Study: 1988/94. (NELS:88).* National Education Longitudinal Studies of the National Center for Education Statistics.**

National Opinion Research Center. *General Social Survey*.

National Youth Employment Coalition's Study to Develop Indicators of Youth Development for the Annie E. Casey Foundation. *Youth Opinion Survey*. Washington, DC, 1999.

Organizational Assessment. (Proprietary survey conducted by Abt for a private sector client.)

Public/Private/Abt Associates. *Summer Career Exploration Program (SCEP) Baseline Survey*. Philadelphia, PA, 1999.

Quick, Thomas. *Successful Team Building*. American Management Association, New York, 1992.

Teens Teaching Inclusion: Entry Evaluation and Survey.

Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy. *Measuring Citizenship*.

Note: Instruments in bold are from national studies.

Corporation for National Service
1201 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20525
(202) 606-5000
TTY (202) 565-2799
www.nationalservice.org